

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

As mentioned above, proposed drawing amendments are submitted herewith under a separate cover letter. Specifically, the text labeling element 34 of Figure 9 has been amended from “Shift registrar” to “Shift register,” the text labeling element 53 of Figure 10 has been amended from “Comparator” to “First Counter,” and the text labeling element 53 of Figure 11 has been amended from “Comparator” to “First Counter.” These drawing amendments are editorial in nature and do not add new matter to the application.

Claims 2 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. In addition, claims 1, 4, 6, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 22 have been amended to overcome the rejections discussed below.

Further, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-22 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the

Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Szajnowski (U.S. 6,751,639) and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being an improper dependent claim. These rejections are considered moot in view of the above-mentioned cancellation of claim 2.

Further, claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 16, 17, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for reciting limitations that lack proper antecedent basis and/or for reciting limitations without adequate structural basis.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 16, 17, 19 and 22 have been amended to correct any antecedent basis issues and to clearly provide adequate structure basis for the limitations recites therein. Specifically, note that claims 19 and 22 have been amended to reflect, for example, the structural elements identified in Figure 14. Therefore, withdrawal of the above-mentioned is 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being an improper dependent claim. Please note that claim 18 also recites similar limitations to claim 21.

In view of the above, claims 18 and 21 have been amended to remove their dependency from independent claims 15 and 16, respectively. Therefore, withdrawal of this 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyasu YAMAMOTO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

2008.07.24 17:59:24 -04'00'

By: _____

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 24, 2008